

REMARKS

Applicant has received the final Office action dated October 15, 2010, in which the Examiner: 1) allowed claims 1-10, 18-27, and 35; 2) found claims 14-17 and 31-34 allowable if rewritten in independent form, but objected to as depending from a rejected base claim;¹ and 3) rejected claims 11-13, 28-30, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Kim (U.S. Pat. No. 6,320,949).

With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 11, 28, and 36, and cancelled claims 14 and 31. With these amendments and the remarks presented below Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) OVER KIM

A. Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 14 which the Examiner found to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-13 are allowable over the cited art.

B. Claim 28

Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 31 which the Examiner found to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28-30 are allowable over the cited art.

C. Claim 36

Claim 36 has been amended to include limitations similar to those of cancelled claim 14 which the Examiner found allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 is allowable over the cited art.

II. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that

¹ The Office Action fails to state a reason for the objections. In a telephone interview with Examiner Phung conducted on December 27, 2010 regarding the objections, the Examiner confirmed that the claims were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form.

the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/David M. Wilson/

David M. Wilson
PTO Reg. No. 56,790
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
3404 E. Harmony Road
Fort Collins, CO 80528